

## University of Groningen

### Analogical predictions

Romeijn, J.-W.

*Published in:*  
Erkenntnis

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2006

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Romeijn, J.-W. (2006). Analogical predictions. *Erkenntnis*, (64), 253-280.

#### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

#### Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# ANALOGICAL PREDICTIONS

J.W. Romeyn

Department of Philosophy,  
Groningen University, The Netherlands  
j.w.romeyn@philos.rug.nl

## 1. Introduction

This paper deals with exchangeable analogical predictions, and proposes a Bayesian model for such predictions. The paper first discerns two kinds of analogical predictions, based on similarity of individuals and of types respectively. It then introduces a Bayesian framework that employs hypotheses for making predictions. This framework is used to describe predictions based on the similarity of individuals, and further relates exchangeable predictions with a specific partition of hypotheses on types. Exchangeable predictions based on type similarity are determined by prior probabilities over the partition, but the partition obstructs the control over the similarity relations. Finally the paper develops a model for exchangeable predictions based on type similarity, which employs hypotheses on similarity between individuals, thereby offering a better control over the similarity relations.

## 2. Similarity of individuals and types

This section introduces the two kinds of similarity that play a role in analogical predictions. It further describes the relation between the predicates associated with these similarities.

Following (Niiniluoto 1981), analogical predictions based on similarity between individuals have this form:

$$M_1 a_1 \sqcap M_2 a_1$$

$$M_1 a_2 \sqcap M_2 a_2$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\dots \\
M_1 a_t \sqcap M_2 a_t \\
M_1 a_{t+1} \\
\hline
\text{probably } M_2 a_{t+1}.
\end{array}$$

That is, the similarity between individuals  $a_1$  to  $a_t$  and the further individual  $a_{t+1}$  is derived from the fact that all of them satisfy the predicate  $M_1$ . This similarity is subsequently used to derive from  $M_2 a_1$  to  $M_2 a_t$  that probably also  $M_2 a_{t+1}$ . The similarity involved in this inference is between individuals  $a_1$  to  $a_t$  on the one hand, and the further individual  $a_{t+1}$  on the other.

Imagine that we have a limited number  $L$  of  $M$ -predicates, indexed  $k$ , which can be either true or false of an individual. Denote the above predications of  $a_i$  as  $M^m_k a_i$ , where  $m = 0$  or  $m = 1$  for  $M_k a_i$  being true or false respectively. We can define the type predicate of an individual  $a_i$  as cells  $Q$  in the partition generated by the  $M$ -predicates. These cells are determined with an  $L$ -tuple  $q$  of the binaries  $m$ , which encode the satisfaction of  $M$ -predicates by individual  $a_i$ :

$$q = \sqcap m_1, m_2, \dots, m_L \sqcap.$$

So every individual  $a_i$  can be assigned a unique type predicate  $Q^q$ , which refers to one particular cell in the partition generated by the  $M$ -predicates. I sometimes refer to the type predicates as  $Q$ -predicates, and where convenient I denote the  $L$ -tuples  $q$  with natural numbers.

Imagine that we only have access to the types, or  $Q$ -predicates, and not to the  $M$ -predicates underlying these types. In that case we can still make analogical predictions. For example, it may be that we consider type  $Q^1$  more similar to type  $Q^2$  than type  $Q^0$ , where these type numbers refer to specific  $L$ -tuples  $q$ , and further that we observe the  $t$ -th individual to be of type  $Q^1$ . Then, apart from deeming  $Q^1$  more probable for the next individual, we may also take the effect of observing  $Q^1$  to be more favourable to  $Q^2$  than to  $Q^0$ . The observation of  $Q^1$  is thus assumed to have some predictive relevance for  $Q^2$  as

well. Below I give a formal definition of this kind of analogical prediction. For now, note that the example is an analogical prediction based on similarity between types of individuals.

### 3. Bayesian framework

The following contains a brief introduction into a Bayesian framework that employs hypotheses for making predictions. It deals with observations, belief states, hypotheses, updating by conditioning, and predictions.

In expressing the observations of  $Q$ - or  $M$ -predicates, it will be convenient to omit reference to the individuals  $a_i$ . Instead we can refer to the observations directly by adding a time index to the predicates. Thus, the expressions  $Q^q_t$  and  $M^m_{kt}$  refer to the observations of individual  $a_t$  having predicates  $Q^q$  and  $M^m_k$  respectively. The expressions  $E^Q_t$  and  $E^M_{Tt}$  refer to sequences of such observations, having length  $t$ , or a vector of such lengths  $T$ . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} Q^q_t \sqcap E^Q_{t-1} &= E^Q_t, \\ M^m_{kt} \sqcap E^M_{Tb} &= E^M_{Ta}, \end{aligned}$$

in which  $T_b$  and  $T_a$  are vectors of lengths having  $t-1$  and  $t$  in the  $k$ -th element respectively. The remainder of this section deals with  $Q$ -predicates. The formal treatment of  $M$ -predicates is analogous.

Belief is represented with a probability function  $p$ , which takes observations and hypotheses as arguments. Observations  $Q^q_t$  are defined above. Hypotheses  $H$  are general observational statements that prescribe specific probabilities for the observations  $Q^q_t$ . The prescribed probabilities  $p(Q^q_t | H \sqcap E^Q_{t-1})$  are called the likelihoods of observations  $Q^q_t$  on hypothesis  $H$ . A partition of hypotheses  $P = \{ H_\square | \square \in [0,1] \}$  is a collection of such general statements that are together assumed to exhaust logical space.

When we observe  $Q^q_t$ , our new belief can be represented with the same probability function conditioned on the new observation:

$$p(\cdot | E_{t-1}^Q) = \int p(\cdot | Q_t \sqcup E_{t-1}^Q) .$$

This transition between belief states is called updating by conditioning. We can update the probability assigned to hypotheses by means of the likelihoods on these hypotheses:

$$p(H_{\square} | Q_t^q \sqcup E_{t-1}^Q) = p(H_{\square} | E_{t-1}^Q) \int p(Q_t^q | H_{\square} \sqcup E_{t-1}^Q) / p(Q_t^q | E_{t-1}^Q) .$$

Moreover, using the partition we can write the denominator  $p(Q_t^q | E_{t-1}^Q)$  in terms of likelihoods and probabilities over hypotheses:

$$p(Q_t^q | E_{t-1}^Q) = \int p(H_{\square} | E_{t-1}^Q) \int p(Q_t^q | H_{\square} \sqcup E_{t-1}^Q) d\square .$$

The predictions  $p(Q_{t+1}^q | E_t^Q)$  can be expressed in the same way. In sum, they can be derived from a partition  $P$ , a prior probability  $p(H_{\square})$ , the likelihoods  $p(Q_i^q | H_{\square} \sqcup E_{i-1}^Q)$  for  $i$  ranging from 1 to  $t+1$ , and the observations  $E_t^Q$ .

The above may seem an unnecessarily complicated framework for making predictions: we can also define predictions directly, as a function of previous observations  $E_t^Q$  and some further parameters. However, as I will show, hypotheses are very useful in laying down the assumptions underlying analogical predictions.

#### 4. Similarity between individuals

Consider again the analogical predictions based on similarity between individuals, as introduced in section 1. We can model these predictions using the framework of section 2. This section defines the model by means of a specific partition of hypotheses.

To model similarity between individuals we can use a partition of hypotheses  $H_{\square}$ , which is summarised with the following diagram:

		$M_2 \sqcup$		1	0				
$M_1 \sqcup$		<table> <tr> <td><math>\square_1 \square_2^1</math></td> <td><math>\square_1(1-\square_2^1)</math></td> </tr> <tr> <td><math>(1-\square_1) \square_2^0</math></td> <td><math>(1-\square_1)(1-\square_2^0)</math></td> </tr> </table>		$\square_1 \square_2^1$	$\square_1(1-\square_2^1)$	$(1-\square_1) \square_2^0$	$(1-\square_1)(1-\square_2^0)$		
$\square_1 \square_2^1$	$\square_1(1-\square_2^1)$								
$(1-\square_1) \square_2^0$	$(1-\square_1)(1-\square_2^0)$								
	1								

Every hypothesis  $H_{\square}$  is characterised by a vector  $\square$  containing parameters  $\square_1$ ,  $\square_2^1$ , and  $\square_2^0$ . The diagram shows the likelihoods of the  $M$ -predicates conditional on these hypotheses. The parameter  $\square_1$  is the likelihood of  $M^1_{1t}$  for any  $t$ :


$$p(M^1_{1t} | H_{\square} \sqcap E^M_{\square-1,t'} \square) = \square_1 .$$

The parameters  $\square_2^1$  and  $\square_2^0$  are the likelihoods of  $M^1_{2t}$  on  $H_{\square}$ , conditioned on the further occurrence of  $M^1_{1t}$  and  $M^0_{1t}$  respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} p(M^1_{2t} | H_{\square} \sqcap E^M_{\square-1,t'} \square \sqcap M^1_{1t}) &= \square_2^1 , \\ p(M^1_{2t} | H_{\square} \sqcap E^M_{\square-1,t'} \square \sqcap M^0_{1t}) &= \square_2^0 . \end{aligned}$$

The probability distribution over the partition of hypotheses  $H_{\square}$  is a function of the three independent parameters in  $\square$ .


With this partition of hypotheses in place, I can make explicit how the predictions resulting from it employ similarity between individuals. Assume that the prior probability distribution over hypotheses  $H_{\square}$  is uniform, so that the marginal distributions over the parameters in  $\square$  are uniform too:



Furthermore, assume that the observations until  $t$  are those given in the example of section 1:

$$E_T^M = M_{11}^1 \square M_{21}^1 \square M_{12}^1 \square M_{22}^1 \cdots M_{1t}^1 \square M_{2t}^1.$$

We can then compute a probability over the hypotheses conditional on these observations. The marginal distributions of this updated distribution will look approximately as follows:



Since there has been no relevant observation on the value of  $\square_2^0$ , the distribution over  $\square_2^0$  has not changed. But the distributions over  $\square_1$  and  $\square_2^1$  are both tilted towards higher values. This is because updating with the observations of  $M_{1i}^1$  and  $M_{2i}^1$  favours hypotheses that have higher likelihoods  $\square_1$  and  $\square_2^1$  for these observations.

Now we can compare the prediction of  $M_{2t+1}^1$  based on the observations  $E_T^M$  and  $E_T^M \square M_{1t+1}^1$  respectively. This difference measures the effect of taking individual  $a_{t+1}$  to be similar to the observed individuals  $a_1$  to  $a_t$ , for which  $M_1$  was true. Using the above likelihoods, the predictions are

$$p(M_{2t+1}^1 | E_T^M) = \square p(H_{\square} | E_T^M) \square [\square_1 \square_2^1 + (1-\square_1) \square_2^0] d\square ,$$

$$p(M_{2t+1}^1 | E_T^M \square M_{1t+1}^1) = \square p(H_{\square} | E_T^M) \square \square_2^1 d\square .$$

It can easily be verified that the prediction based on  $E_T^M$  and the further observation that  $M_{1t+1}^1$  is higher than the one based on  $E_T^M$  alone. The Bayesian framework thus models analogical predictions based on similarity between individuals.

## 5. Exchangeability and type similarity priors

The above concerns predictions based on direct observations of  $M$ -predicates. Similarity of individuals is exhibited in the  $M$ -predicates that the individuals have in common. However, in many cases we do not have access to  $M$ -predicates, but only to  $Q$ -predicates. Similarity between individuals must then be replaced by similarity between types. The remainder of this paper is devoted to analogical predictions based on type similarity.

The following only discusses exchangeable analogical predictions. Let the operation  $\square_i[\cdot]$  permute the first and the  $i$ -th observation of a sequence  $E_t^Q$ . The exchangeability of a prediction can then be defined as

$$p(Q_{t+1}^q | \square_i[E_t^Q]) = p(Q_{t+1}^q | E_t^Q).$$

This means that the prediction does not depend on the order of the observations  $Q^q$  in  $E_t^Q$ . In a Bayesian framework, exchangeable predictions can be represented with a specific partition of hypotheses. Assuming that the types  $q$  are numbered 0 to  $K$  and indexed  $j$ , these hypotheses have the following likelihoods:

$$p(Q_t^j | H_{\square} | E_t^Q) = \square_j.$$

A hypothesis  $H_{\square}$  is thus defined by a vector  $\square$  containing parameters  $\square_0$  to  $\square_{K-1}$ . The parameter  $\square_K$  must be such that  $\square_j \square_j = 1$ .

Let me now give a formal definition of type similarity. Following Carnap's original suggestions in (1980), the similarity effect may be rephrased as

$$s_{12} > s_{10} \iff p(Q_{t+1}^1 | Q_t^2 | E_{t-1}^Q) > p(Q_{t+1}^1 | Q_t^0 | E_{t-1}^Q),$$




where  $s_{ij}$  denotes the similarity between types  $i$  and  $j$ . For the purpose of this paper, I take similarity to be reflexive, so that from  $s_{12} > s_{10}$  we also have

$$p(Q^2_{t+1} | Q^1_t \sqcap E^Q_{t-1}) > p(Q^0_{t+1} | Q^1_t \sqcap E^Q_{t-1}).$$

This is a formal expression of the type similarity in the example of section 1. I will not discuss the improved and refined definitions of type similarity suggested in (Kuipers 1984a) or (Festa 1997).

Exchangeable analogical predictions can now be characterised using the partition of  $H_{\square}$ , and an appropriate prior over this partition. Intuitively, it must look somewhat like the following:



The simplex on the left is first transformed into a square by stretching the top corner. The prior over the simplex for  $H_{\square}$  can then be decomposed in a marginal distribution over  $\square_1$  and a continuum of distributions over the transformed simplex, each of them associated with a specific value of  $\square_1$ . The idea behind the continuum is that higher values of  $\square_1$  are associated with distributions that favour  $Q^2$  over  $Q^0$ . If we observe  $Q^1$ , the marginal distribution over  $\square_1$  will tilt towards the higher values, and this will cause the distributions favouring  $Q^2$  to gain more weight. The marginal distribution for  $\square_0$  will then shift slightly towards lower values.

However, this representation makes it difficult to translate the update with  $Q^1$  into an operation on the marginal distribution for  $\square_0$  or  $\square_2$ . A related difficulty is in encoding type similarity relations into the priors. Skyrms (1993), Maher (2001) and others have presented interesting ways to do this more or less indirectly. The last section develops a new method, based on the model of section 3.

## 6. Type similarity model

The idea behind the model is that similarity relations between types can be expressed in terms of shared underlying  $M$ -predicates. This section employs the hypotheses of section 3 to make this idea precise.

Following the example, types  $Q^1$  and  $Q^2$  are highly similar, and both are dissimilar to  $Q^0$ . We can now employ the hypotheses  $H_\square$  to facilitate an expression of the similarity relations. The diagram represents the new hypotheses  $H_{\square\square}$ :

		$M_2 \square$		1	0
$M_1 \square$	1		1	$\emptyset$	
	0		2	0	

This diagram gives the following relations between  $M$ - and  $Q$ -predicates:


$$\begin{aligned}
 M^0_{1t} \square M^0_{2t} &= Q^0_t, \\
 M^1_{1t} \square M^1_{2t} &= Q^1_t, \\
 M^0_{1t} \square M^1_{2t} &= Q^2_t, \\
 M^1_{1t} \square M^0_{2t} &= \emptyset.
 \end{aligned}$$

From this last relation we know that  $\square_2^1 = 0$ . So the hypotheses  $H_{\square}$  are defined by only two parameters. These are related to the original likelihoods of the  $Q$ -predicates on the hypotheses  $H_{\square}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p(Q_t^1 | H_{\square} \square E_t^Q) &= \square_1 = \square_1, \\ p(Q_t^2 | H_{\square} \square E_t^Q) &= (1 - \square_1) \square_2^0 = (1 - \square_1) \square_2^0, \\ p(Q_t^0 | H_{\square} \square E_t^Q) &= (1 - \square_1) (1 - \square_2^0) = (1 - \square_1) (1 - \square_2^0). \end{aligned}$$

In the following, I take the hypotheses to be parameterised with  $\square_1$  and  $\square_2^0$ .

The similarity relations between types can now be expressed with a prior over these new parameters. We can use a marginal distribution  $p_1(\square_1 | E_{t-1}^Q)$ , and a continuum of distributions over  $\square_2^0$  associated with the values of  $\square_1$ :



In this representation the prior is related to the similarity relations much more directly. Because the framework involves no transformation, the marginal distributions for  $\square_j$  can be computed quite easily. The shift in the probability of  $Q_{t+1}^2$  due to the occurrence of  $Q_t^1$  can therefore be readily expressed:

$$\begin{aligned} p(Q_{t+1}^2 | E_{t-1}^Q) &= \int p_1(\square_1 | E_{t-1}^Q) \square_1 A_{\square}(\square_1) d\square_1, \\ p(Q_{t+1}^2 | Q_t^1 \square E_{t-1}^Q) &= \int \square_1 p_1(\square_1 | E_{t-1}^Q) \square_1 A_{\square}(\square_1) d\square_1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_{\square}(\square_1)$  is the average of  $\square_2^0$  as a function of  $\square_1$ . With these expressions for the shifts we have full control over the similarity relations encoded by the prior.

The above presents one example of encoding similarity between types in a prior over hypotheses that employ underlying predicates. Many more underlying predicate structures may be investigated, all of them facilitating different similarity relations. Positing such structures turns out to be a convenient tool for controlling the similarity assumptions used in analogical predictions.

## Literature

- Carnap, R. 1980 “A Basic System of Inductive Logic, Part II”, in Jeffrey, R.C. (ed.), *Studies in Inductive Logic and Probability* Vol.2, Berkeley: University of California Press, 7-150.
- Festa, R. 1997 “Analogy and Exchangeability in Predictive Inferences”, *Erkenntnis* 45, 89-112.
- Kuipers, T.A.F.: 1984a, ‘Two Types of Inductive Analogy by Similarity’, *Erkenntnis* 21, 63-87.
- Maher, P. 2000 ‘Probabilities for Two Properties’, *Erkenntnis* 52, 63-91.
- Niiniluoto, I. 1981 ‘Analogy and Inductive Logic’, *Erkenntnis* 21, 1-34.
- Skyrms, B. 1993 ‘Analogy by Similarity in Hyper-Carnapian Inductive Logic’, in J. Earman, A.I. Janis, G. Massey, and N. Rescher (eds.), *Philosophical Problems of the Internal and External Worlds*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 273-282.